

ARTICLE APPEARED  
ON PAGE AFNEW YORK TIMES  
17 November 1986

# SHULTZ DECLARES HE OPPOSES GIVING MORE ARMS TO IRAN

By BERNARD GWERTZMAN

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 16 — Secretary of State George P. Shultz said today that he was opposed to sending any more military equipment to Iran, but he conceded that he could not speak for the Reagan Administration on this issue.

Breaking his own silence on the secret Iranian operation, Mr. Shultz appeared to contradict President Reagan and White House officials who have asserted that the policy has produced positive results, such as a lessening of terrorism by Iran.

Mr. Shultz said Iran continued to sponsor terrorist acts and had been implicated in the recent kidnappings of three Americans. On Thursday, President Reagan said in a nationally broadcast speech, "Since U.S. Government contacts began with Iran, there's been no evidence of Iranian Government complicity in acts of terrorism against the United States."

Asked if he believed any more arms shipments should be sent to Iran, Mr. Shultz said, "Under the circumstances of Iran's war with Iraq, its pursuit of terrorism, its association with those holding our hostages, I would certainly say, as far as I'm concerned, no."

But when he was asked, "Do you have the authority to speak for the entire Administration?" he replied, "No."

## Potentially Embarrassing

It is rare and potentially embarrassing for a Secretary of State to publicly advocate a course of action and then admit that his views are not necessarily those of the Administration for which he is the chief foreign policy spokesman.

Because of Mr. Shultz's known opposition to the secret provision of arms to Iran, at a time when he was publicly assuring other nations that the United States was trying to block such arms shipments, there has been speculation that this might ultimately provoke Mr. Shultz to resign.

Appearing on the CBS News program "Face the Nation," Mr. Shultz was asked if he had considered resigning over the Iranian issue. He did not deny such intentions, but replied: "Oh, I talked to the President. I serve at his pleasure, and anything that I have to say on that subject, I'd just say to him."

## Other Developments on Issue

There were these other developments on Iran:

¶Vice Adm. John M. Poindexter, the national security adviser, who was in charge of the operation, said that William J. Casey, director of Central Intelligence, would be the Administration's chief witness at Congressional hearings on Friday.

¶Mr. Reagan held an unpublicized meeting on Saturday at Camp David, Md., with his top advisers to discuss how to handle the Iran problem. No agreements were reached, with Mr. Shultz reportedly at odds with others.

¶The Joint Chiefs of Staff were not informed of the operation in advance, Admiral Poindexter said, because they

had no need to know about the secret shipments of military equipment.

¶Robert C. McFarlane, who preceded Admiral Poindexter in his job, and who made a secret visit to Tehran last May for Mr. Reagan, acknowledged that some of the "moderates" he spoke with in Iran might now be in danger of being executed.

Mr. Shultz seemed to be still at odds with the White House over the results of the operation. This has left the appearance of an Administration with its policy uncoordinated. It was to bring some unanimity that Mr. Reagan and his top advisers discussed the issue at Camp David before the arrival of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Britain, but apparently no hard decisions were reached.

This comes at a time when a possible confrontation looms with Congress. Both the House and Senate Intelligence committees have scheduled closed door hearings for Friday.

Admiral Poindexter said today that Mr. Casey would be the chief Administration witness before the committees because the Iran operation was primarily an "intelligence" matter. Members of both committees have asked that Admiral Poindexter, Mr. McFarlane and Lieut. Col. Oliver North of Admiral Poindexter's staff, testify as well.

Admiral Poindexter, who appeared on the NBC News program "Meet the Press," said, "We are very anxious to discuss in great detail with the appropriate Congressional committees under the appropriate circumstances," but he suggested that it was unlikely he or other White House aides would testify at a formal hearing. Traditionally, under the broad mantle of "executive privilege," aides to the President do not have to testify before Congressional committees.

One senior Senate Democrat, speaking anonymously, said that he doubted Congress would seek to overturn a decision by the White House not to allow Admiral Poindexter and other aides to testify.

Congressional hearings. On Saturday, Larry Speakes, the White House spokesman, said in an interview over the Cable News Network that Mr. Shultz would testify because he "is always our point man and our leader of the Cabinet in the foreign policy area."

An aide to Mr. Shultz said that while he might be asked to testify, Mr. Shultz could not be the primary witness because he had so little to do with it.

Mr. Shultz said on "Face the Nation" that he had no quarrel with Mr. Reagan's decision taken 18 months ago to "probe" the possibility of altering Iran's policies. But as to the subsequent decision to provide a limited quantity of military equipment as a good faith "signal" to Iran, Mr. Shultz said, "We have a policy of not sending

As the Administration continued to try to justify the secret policy of providing shipments of military equipment to Iran, despite a highly publicized campaign to bar such shipments, Mr. Shultz made it clear that while he was trying to avoid a public break with Mr. Reagan, he strongly believed that Iran remained a terrorist nation.

Mr. Shultz said that Iran was "recalcitrant" in opposing an end to the war with Iraq, and had ties to the groups that kidnapped three more Americans in Beirut in recent months, even as the Administration was gaining the release of three others in return for the military shipments.

Mr. Shultz's problems with the Iran policy are a major source of concern to the White House, in the face of looming arms, and the President decided that he would go ahead and send this signal."

The Presidential order setting the Iran program in motion is in a classified finding that explains the reasons for the operation and orders the Central Intelligence Agency not to report it to Congress.

The New York Times reported Saturday that the classified executive order said that Congress would not be told of the operation because of the "extreme sensitivity" and "security risks" involved in the program, according to a source who saw the order. The same day, The Washington Post reported an interview with Admiral Poindexter, in which he said, "The finding only existed in its original form in my safe."